1	MELINDA HAAG (CABN 132612) United States Attorney DAVID R. CALLAWAY (CABN 121782) Chief, Criminal Division	
2 3		
4	KYLE F. WALDINGER (CABN 298752) Assistant United States Attorney 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055 San Francisco, California 94102-3495 Telephone: (415) 436-6830 Facsimile: (415) 436-7234 E-mail: Kyle.Waldinger@usdoj.gov Attorneys for United States of America	
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
12	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
13	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) No. CR 12-0608 YGR
14	Plaintiff,)) [PROPOSED] ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING) TRIAL
15	v.) TRIAL
16	GABRIELA TIGGES,))
17	Defendant.)))
18		J
19	The United States moved for the pretrial detention of the defendant Gabriela Tigges at the	
20	defendant's initial appearance in this District on May 4, 2015. The matter came before the Court on	
21	May 6, 2015, for a hearing on the United States' motion for detention. The defendant Gabriela Tigges	
22	was present and represented by attorneys Robert Beles and Elliot Silver. Assistant United States	
23	Attorney Kyle Waldinger appeared for the United States. Pretrial Services submitted to the Court and	
24	the parties a report previously prepared in the Eastern District of New York, as well as a report recently	
25	prepared by Pretrial Services in this District. A representative of Pretrial Services was present at the	
26	hearing.	
27	At the hearing, the government continued to seek detention; the defendant opposed that motion,	
28	and sought pretrial release on conditions pursuant to a secured bond. Proffers and arguments regarding	
	[PROPOSED] ORDER OF DETENTION	

detention and release were submitted by the parties at the hearing.

Upon consideration of the facts, proffers, and arguments presented, the Court finds by a preponderance of the evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release at this time will reasonably assure the appearance of the defendant as required. Accordingly, the Court concludes that the defendant must be detained pending trial in this matter.

This Order supplements the Court's findings at the detention hearing and serves as written findings of fact and statement of reasons as required by 18 U.S.C. § 3142(i)(1).

The Court finds that the defendant appears to have left the United States more than five years ago and has stayed in Brazil since that time, all in an effort to avoid potential criminal charges in the United States. The government proffered that the defendant took her minor children out of school in the middle of the school year in about late 2009 and went to Brazil after one of her former employees was arrested and prosecuted. Since that time, several of the defendant's other former employees have been prosecuted. Based on the government's proffer, it appears that the defendant purposefully avoided coming back to the United States for more than five years because, as she stated to a former employee in 2011, she wanted to avoid any "red flags" at the passport check point and because she did not want to take any chances at that point in her life. Since her departure, the defendant appears to have been monitoring the status of any criminal investigation regarding her. These facts and the other facts proffered by the government at the detention hearing support the conclusion that the defendant was concerned about being prosecuted in this country, and that she left the United States and stayed away from the United States because of that concern and to avoid prosecution, thus making her a risk of flight.

In addition, the Court notes that the defendant is a citizen of Brazil and has strong ties to that country, and that she also may have a German or European Union passport. The government proffered that several hundred thousand dollars was wired to the defendant's bank account in Brazil in 2010, and the Pretrial Services report provides information that the defendant owns a home and a group of small apartments in Brazil. In addition, the government proffered that two of the defendant's children still reside in Brazil. Accordingly, the defendant's ties to Brazil are quite strong, while her ties to the United States have become attenuated at least to some extent through her five-year absence from this country. Although the United States of America has an extradition treaty with Brazil, the government has

proffered (and the defense has not disputed) that Brazil does not extradite its own citizens to the United States under that treaty. Should the defendant flee to Brazil, the government essentially will have no way to get her back to this country.

Accordingly, based on all of the facts set forth above and proffered by the government at the detention hearing, the Court finds by a preponderance of the evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release at this time will reasonably assure the appearance of the defendant as required.

Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3142(i), IT IS ORDERED THAT:

- (1) the defendant be, and hereby is, committed to the custody of the Attorney General for confinement in a corrections facility separate, to the extent practicable, from persons awaiting or serving sentences or being held in custody pending appeal;
- (2) the defendant be afforded reasonable opportunity for private consultation with her counsel; and
- (3) on order of a court of the United States or on request of an attorney for the government, the person in charge of the corrections facility in which the defendant is confined shall deliver the defendant to an authorized Deputy United States Marshal for the purpose of any appearance in connection with a court proceeding in this case.

Dated: May _7_, 2015

United States Magistrate Judge

28